

Civil Service Board Meeting

April 3, 2014

Board Members Present: Marv Rosen
Carolyn Worthington
Alan Coxie
Lynn Moffa

Board Member Absent:
Virginia Robinson

Others Present: Patsy Brison
Kelley Dickens
Derrick Swing
Jennifer Johnson
Justin Smith
Chief Scott Burnette
Mike Knisely
Council Woman Wisler
Chief William Anderson

Marv Rosen - Call to order & Good Afternoon,
I wanted to bring up an item to everyone's awareness: I spent an informative hour with the City Manager, City Attorney, our liaison, Council woman Wisler and our attorney, Patsy Brison to help us better understand our roles and responsibilities of the Civil Service Board. Without getting into specifics there were several broad issues brought up and I just want to bring those things to the Board's attention. We will have an opportunity in the future to get together and meet with that same group and get additional feedback.

The major question is what is our role?

1. Occasional questions about the decorum of the Board Members, as chairman I make a commitment to do my best that we speak and address each other as mature adults.
2. There is a question of how far you we can go with questions that we initiate giving to the interpretation of the Civil Service Law.
3. Some items I agree with, some I don't agree with. Those issues were brought to my attention and I intend to make this board to continue to function as I see very effectively observing the Civil Service law.
4. Any questions or comments? (None)

On our agenda today, we have several items. First relates to approval of minutes from previous meetings. Generally when we receive minutes, go ahead and make the corrections and send back to HR. Hopefully you have received some of these minutes back with corrections from Board members.

Derrick Swing – Not recently, but that would be great to get immediate feedback from the members and send them back out corrected.

Marv Rosen - It makes it much faster for us to go through and correct.

In regard to November 2013 meeting minutes, is anyone ready to make a motion to approve?

Carolyn Worthington – I can't remember when we received those. I'm sure we did.

Marv Rosen – The minutes from that meeting dealt with the Chief Burnette's promotional advisory committee changes to engineer process, some discussion of the promotional criteria advisory committee. Is anyone familiar with these? I cannot make a motion.

Patsy Brison – I didn't see them with the package. The only ones I saw were March of 2014.

Kelley Dickens – I believe they were sent out prior. I'm sorry I didn't bring stuff with me since I came from another meeting. I thought we had sent those out and they had been on the agenda. I can get some copies or we can just mail them back out.

Alan Coxie – Actually that would be better and it's easier to keep track of when there has been so much to look at since our pace of activity has been so high so I feel a little uncomfortable approving something without having in front of me.

Marv Rosen – I support that. Is there a motion to approve December minutes, 128 pages I believe? Let us move to January, motion to approve? It dealt primarily with the Fire Dept. and consequences of how to remediate our grievance decision concerning the Fortenberry case.

Alan Coxie –Can I make a suggestion to the chair that we look for a meeting that has a low agenda volume and have all those minutes here and take some time to review them and approve them, would that work?

Marv Rosen – I think we could do that. But we've neglected for several months to get some of these minutes approved and with the lack of familiarity, I think we would have to do that. I encourage board members to try and expedite them in the future. If everyone is agreeable to withholding motions today in terms of accepting previous minutes I'm agreeable to do that.

Lynn Moffa – I agree with Alan, except with regards to the grievance hearing. I have that, I wouldn't expect you to have it. I also think that a copy would be better given at meeting, I need to have that in front of me to look at quickly, I think we would all be more comfortable approving it with a copy in front of us. I might not remember even if I had printed it out two weeks earlier.

Alan Coxie – I agree.

Marv Rosen – Kelley, can you help us with that?

Kelley Dickens – Yes.

Lynn Moffa – Sorry to sound like children with our home work but it's a little bit like that but the paper mass starts getting a little bit overwhelming.

Alan Coxie – And it's hard to want to throw emotion out there when you can't almost remember what was in each one.

Marv Rosen – I generally look at on my computer and make notes that's substantive and do it that way and not run out of paper. We will put that on for our next agenda. HR will provide us, I will not need copies, but if you could provide for the other board members it would be helpful.

Derrick Swing – Everything except the grievance?

Alan Coxie – How do you feel about one copy of the grievance we could all pass around and notes of minutes to cut down on paper?

Kelley Dickens – We would be happy to do whatever the board wishes. In the past, board members, if they had issues would print those copies and make their notes and bring them with them with their changes and then we could get them back out to them prior to the meeting.

Marv Rosen - Chief Burnette?

Chief Burnette – Thank you, sir. We have four promotional processes the fire department would like to begin. Two of which, we would begin immediately by next week and the other two in the month of May. I'd like to give you an update on where we with two of those processes. Battalion Chief and LT. that we would like to begin in the month of May and also review the minimum requirements and process structure that the Promotional Advisory Committee is recommending for the Apparatus Officer and Fire and Life Safety Educator. Beginning with Battalion Chief we currently have four vacancies, would like to get moving on that process quickly. We are talking with the Promotional Advisory Committee and as we have discussed with Civil Service Board we want to make sure we have sufficient interest and numerous candidates and to select the most qualified. The APD policy, 1073, that you have on your agenda for today and I believe discussed last month, there's interest within our department in doing something very similar. Rather than moving forward immediately, what we discussed yesterday with the Promotional Criteria Advisory Committee was to continue to look at this in the Police department and feasibility within the Fire Department. We would like to follow their policy as close as possible and continue to have that conversation within the Department over the next 30 days and come back to Civil Service Board at the May meeting with a recommendation for eligibility for the Battalion Chief process. The

committee recommendation was that a policy similar to APD's policy would expand the pool of qualified participants in the Battalion Chief process. That is where we are with the Battalion Chief process. Are there any questions on that promotional process?

Marv Rosen – Is there anything in particular with policy 1073 that you saw as something that is applicable?

Chief Burnette – Yes, currently we have added minimum requirement to participate in the Battalion Chief 's process was an Associate's Degree in emergency services and 5 years as a company officer so after that LT's promotion, a minimum of five years and the current rank of Captain. Looking at the Police Department's policy, a combination of training and experience in lieu of just the formal education requirement would be equivalent. If someone had more years of experience or more training hours and did not yet have that Associate's Degree then they could participate. That is the part of APD's policy that we had interest in mirroring. One of the items of information that I have heard and people in our department have heard is that one of the obstacles of advanced degree requirement so opening that door for someone with that experience and they earn their degree after that promotion might allow some to participate in process. We really wanted another 30 days to see how we could mirror the Police Department's policy and come back to the Board for recommendations, minimum requirements and process structure.

Moving on to the Sr. Specialist Emergency Management Apparatus officer, We have one position, it is a day time assignment, vacated by retirement. The position was occupied for 10 years and we have never had promotional requirements or a process established for that position. Now that there has been a retirement from that position the Promotional Criteria Advisory committee has come forward with some recommendations as we promote someone into that position and what the minimum requirements are. There's a handout that says AFD Senior Specialist Apparatus Officer stating that the minimum requirements that the Advisory committee is recommending. Four years at AFR as a Senior Firefighter, which correlates with to become a senior firefighter of two years so it's a minimum of six years with the Fire Department, it could be longer depending on when they got their Senior Firefighter position. Haz mat operations level, driver operator firefighter II and N.C. E.M.T. On the back of that handout, the process structure being recommended by the Advisory Committee meets four components. Each one of these being one fourth of the process. Those four are a structured interview, a record keeping exercise, prioritization exercise and a role play scenario. This position is the liaison that between our General Services Department, our mechanics in Fleet and also all the numerous external vendors that we deal with to keeping our apparatus on the road and serviceable. The position makes the safety decisions on whether a fire truck is in service or not. After the engineer does a daily truck check, as an example, if they have a question as to whether or not the tread on the tires are acceptable then this is the person that would make that termination whether to get them changed or not. That's the type of decisions this position would make. They are heavily involved when we purchase a new fire truck and the tools on them.

Carolyn Worthington – Who participates in the structured interview?

Chief Burnette – We would have a Process manager, working with our Human Resources Department developing interview questions, having a minimum of three external assessors. We would seek these from fire departments in our region to come in and assist us. We would do the same for the structured interviews, record keeping exercise. That is a huge part of that person's role. They would need to negotiate system well and get that information out of it. Those types of exercises are ones that we're familiar with, especially with our risk management system.

Carolyn Worthington – Would you have a consistent check list for each observer?

Chief Burnette – Yes, They would have the same questions and all would ask the same questions. Holly Waltemyer in Human Resources, spends the first part of that day and is very helpful to help raters understand process and how important consistency is. They are educated in terms and going through errors that the raters could make and explaining the scoring process with examples. A candidate that gets a 5 meets this expectation. There is a numerical rating, typically 1-10.

Alan Coxie – Are you able to find these outside assessors that actually have experience of this type?

Chief Burnette – This is the first time we've done this process. It would certainly be much different from our others but we can certainly find LTs, Captains and Battalion Chiefs all across the state. Departments our size and bigger typically have this type of position in some respect and it would be our goal to have outside assessors with experience of this type.

Lynn Moffa – Will you be getting the retiring person's input also since they've been in it for ten years?

Chief Burnette – Yes, he retired back in the summer and so he was able to give his input before he retired but as it was developed and approved, he wasn't at the meeting. I spoke with him yesterday about this position. The Fire Department would request the Board's approval of these minimum requirements.

Marv Rosen – Would you like to briefly talk about the Fire, Life and Safety Educator also?

Chief Burnette – Yes sir,

Patsy Brison – You might, just to interrupt, want to take them one at a time. I don't have a copy of it.

Alan Coxie – One last question. Have you done a job description on this particular position?

Chief Burnette – Yes sir, I didn't bring the job classification.

Lynn Moffa – It would be helpful to have the job description.

Marv Rosen- Before you move on Chief, the first question, Apparatus Officer? Is there a motion?

Alan Coxie – I make a motion that we accept the promotional process criteria as presented to us by Asheville Fire and Rescue Dept. for AFD Senior Specialist without change.

Carolyn Worthington – Second.

Marv Rosen- Motion passes unanimously.

Chief Burnette - The second handout is a Fire and Life Safety Educator. This position is also under our Emergency Management division. It also only has only one person in this role and the position is a day time assignment. We have not had a process for this position, it is a position that has been held for ten years also.

The Promotion Criteria Advisory Committee has the minimum requirement listed on handout. Four years as a Senior Firefighter, NC Fire and Safety Educator Level II, Child passenger safety technician, for child safety seat program, Fire Inspector I and within one year of promotion, obtain Fire and Life Safety Educator III, CPS instructor, CPR instructor and office of the Fire Marshall trailer towing certification within one year. This person has to pull the Fire and Life Safety houses and that is the reason it is needed. This position is responsible for managing all our fire education programs so they are an educator, they have relationships with both school system. They develop and deliver programs and make sure all the members of our department have all the tools and information they need. They interact with over 6000 people annually, fire training , training for industry. The back of the hand out has outline of proposed process advised by the Advisory committee. Also four components, each worth 25% of the process, structured interview, a programs development presentation, a lesson plan and then a role play scenario.

Carolyn Worthington – As part of the Fire and Safety Educator, do they get experience in adult education? Is it needed going in?

Chief Burnette – It is part of the curriculum, it is instruction on methodology for all age groups. It breaks down to about 5 categories for children. The Level II Fire and Life Safety Educator is someone who is trained to in developing programs and the Level III is someone that is trained in managing the delivery of those programs.

Alan Coxie – How did the vacancy come about for this position?

Chief Burnette – We're placing more emphasis on community education. We had one person in this role who had a lot of that so seeing the need to focus heavily on community engagement with the Fire department, public safety specifically, we are taking the incumbent and taking the fire and life safety component so that person can focus on other information exclusively. It's a re-engineering of those.

Marv Rosen – Motion?

Alan Coxie – I make a motion that we accept the AFD Senior Specialist Fire and Life Safety Educator promotional process as recommended to us by Asheville Fire Dept.

Lynn Moffa – Second.

Marv Rosen – Passed unanimously

Chief Burnette – An update on LT., we want to kick that process off in May. Professional credentials component which is 15% of the process as a review for the Board that is one of items Board asked us to look at in relation to the number of years that someone is allowed to count training credit. The last five years are what we count as professional credentials. The Promotional Criteria Advisory committee is establishing a draft of a professional credentials work book. We hope to have it done in the next five or six days.

Lynn Moffa – What is multiplier?

Chief Burnette - 15%, professional credentials for engineers is only for experience and is another draft committee is putting together for recommendations for improvements. Right now the only experience the LT. professional credentials workbook includes formal education, experience and professional development, profession contribution which has five sub categories. Professional memberships, training hours, contributions to the fire service, public speaking, things like that. That concludes my presentation.

Marv Rosen – Thanks Chief. We look forward to your coming back in May, I appreciate your considering our recommendations and finding a way to work this out.

Chief Burnette – Thank You.

Marv Rosen – I believe Chief Anderson has arrived.

Derrick gave out APD handouts

Marv Rosen- Good afternoon Chief, I asked you to come today to follow up on some up on some thoughts I had as we have reviewed Asheville Fire Department's promotional policies. It led me to go back and look at APD's policy 1073 and get your feedback as how that has worked since the changes in 2011, I have minutes from our Meeting of May 4, 2012 and there is a good deal of discussion surrounding that meeting in terms of the

actual practice of what weight is given to different factor within the evaluation and factoring your individual interview as well and review of personnel files. Is there any history from 2012 Sgt's and Lt's promotions, how that process weighed out after those names were passed on to you. After the assessment center is complete and the list goes to you, how is that list ordered?

Chief Anderson – Rank ordered by their scores as a result of the assessment center and no one sees this other than me, HR and each individual candidate is provided their score as well the comments and results of the assessment center individually.

Marv Rosen – Each individual receives feedback with the rating but no public listing to see how they compare to other people?

Chief Anderson – Yes.

Marv Rosen – What is the rationale for not publishing the rank order?

Chief Anderson – It has been my experience if I'm participating in a promotional process, I think that is privileged information and I do not necessarily want that shared, if the employee wants to share with others, that is up to the individual. I think it may be considered part of their personnel file also. We make sure that they have their score and all comments from the assessors and they have the ability to contact HR to review further.

Alan Coxie – Then you are saying that when you do a promotional process in the Police Department it is not published by rank order of the employee?

Chief Anderson – That's correct.

Carolyn Worthington – Why would you not feel comfortable in publishing scores but no names?

Chief Anderson – One of the things we have considered doing is publishing list in alphabetical order of those that passed the process but not necessarily the ranking of how they finished.

Kelley Dickens – The Chief has been given that discretion to do Chief's interview as a final review process for each position. We don't want employees looking at the list assuming that they are the next on the list and actually getting the promotion. That was given back in May of 2012.

Marv Rosen – As I review there were a good number of comments that were related to that and in part I'd like to know how that process has been working and if it has been fair and transparent. The minutes from May are in front of you. Let's see how it works today. There were several comments that after the assessment is completed, how are

people informed and the weight your interview holds and some way to objectify and substantiate how your interview affects people.

Chief Anderson – The weight of my interview has yet to change the ranking. Rarely has it affected the outcome or their score, only once has that happened and that was for other reason. First of all, I'm going to sit down with them and talk to them about the process. Do you think it was fair, their performance, the questions are the same for each candidate, education, goals, skill levels and history with the department.

Marv Rosen- Over the last seven year history, there was only one assessment changed, what was the situation?

Chief Anderson – It was a personnel matter.

Lynn Moffa – Do you always select the first person on the list?

Chief Anderson – It has been straight down the list historically even prior to coming to Asheville.

Alan Coxie – When the Chief's interview is completed, I assume that is the last stage of the process, correct? Then is it published?

Chief Anderson – It's not published, it's sent to Human Resources with the scores.

Alan Coxie – There is a difference how Fire and Police do that, I'm familiar with final published lists, but you don't do that? Is the basis for that difference that there might be an employment issue?

Chief Anderson – It's a personnel matter. That person's score is tied to that individual and we make sure the candidate has their information and they want to share with others and that's fine, some do some don't. The department does not share that.

Alan Coxie – I follow.

Marv Rosen – You also said that their personnel file is crucial part of your assessment too. Did you look at any personnel files and did they influence you?

Chief Anderson – I won't say that it influenced my decision, again, I go back to the assessment center. When I am looking at a personnel file, it is for glaring deficiencies that we might have missed that would be of concern that they could perform at that level.

Marv Rosen – Chief Burnette can add up to five points with this process similar to yours. He has used that option only once, it was a personnel related issue. Would you be willing to quantify how the impact of your evaluation affects someone's promotion? It is so hard for me to see how much impact your evaluation has on promoting or not.

Chief Anderson – I think the best way to look at it is we have independent assessors to conduct the assessment, completely independent from the outside of APD. For SGTs, we use Sgt's outside of Buncombe County because we truly want this to be an independent process. We had serious concerns about past promotions, that is why we wanted to go outside to make sure they are completely fair and transparent. The scores are where most of my weight goes to that process. I sit with each and every candidate and have a discussion with them about APD and their future goals and their scoring on this test. I pretty much go with assessment center scores unless they totally blow the interview. I think the assessment center identifies the best candidates for the job. It is designed to test for current trends in our Police Department.

Marv Rosen – There's really no way APD can affect technical or written aspect for the panel interview?

Chief Anderson – Yes, that's the way we want it.

Marv Rosen- Everyone has the same opportunities. I would like a better way to weigh your interview into that process. The way it is written you could choose number six to promote. There were so many abuses in the past...

Chief Anderson – That is why an outside firm is brought in to address this, I don't want good ole boy system. I think we have done that since there have been no grievances since 2012. No complaints have been brought to my attention.

Kelley Dickens – We had 14 promotions in that two year period. If they had any concerns about the Chief's interview they could grieve and Chief Anderson would give his reason.

Lynn Moffa – If you get a grievance, it's a little less transparent. You have this element of non-transparency that could lead to a problem. It is not advertised and you leave yourself open to that charge and grievances.

Chief Anderson – I think we have not had any grievances is because we have followed that ranking. They know where they are and they can review their information.

Lynn Moffa – What if they get the ranking wrong, since it's not public knowledge.

Alan Coxie – I came from the other side of the building where the list published, it was completely transparent. You could tell when a department head followed the list or skipped someone. I do share her concern.

Lynn Moffa – I can see the rationale for not posting the ranking, maybe there is some middle ground. You can choose anybody on the list? Maybe it could be limited and you would have to choose from the top.

Kelley Dickens – We can go away and research best practices.

Marv Rosen – It leaves question very open, what if we have ratings that add up to 100% from the first three. What would prohibit you from being that fourth part of the assessment with your contribution through an interview and then the list comes out?

Alan Coxie – Kelley, what is your view about publishing, is that personnel issue, because one department does and one doesn't?

Kelley Dickens – I think it is part of an interview and selection process and is confidential information. I have struggled with the Fire Dept. publishing a list since I've been here. There is some aspect of personnel privacy. We might need to look again at the Fire Dept. publishing that list. We're not publishing actual scores.

Lynn Moffa – It's inconsistent with the rule change, giving the Chief that discretion if he wants to go below the ranking, it would be the basis of a legitimate grievance.

Alan Coxie – Two departments, done 2 different ways, one does, one doesn't. How did your former employer do it?

Kelley Dickens – I worked for three different counties and none of them did it like Asheville. We would do multiple processes during the year.

Chief Anderson – None of the agencies I've worked for published theirs.

Marv Rosen – What is check and balance if hypothetically went to number six? Would he have to justify that?

Kelley Dickens – I have a good relationship with the Chief, I think if there was a question we would talk that out. We keep up with that as well.

Alan Coxie – What is the check and balance for the employee? If I'm looking at my score and keeping to myself and I have 100 and didn't get promoted, what is that check and balance for me?

Chief Anderson – They could contact Human Resources and HR would explain it to them, historically it hasn't happened.

Marv Rosen – Chief, you would give them answers about their scores and other assessments?

Chief Anderson – Yes.

Alan Coxie – In the one instance, in seven years, that you went around somebody, did you not choose the person for promotion or did the results of your interview kick them lower on list?

Chief Anderson – They were not promoted.

Alan Coxie – Without specifics, what would be an example that would cause you to pass over somebody? Whatever you're comfortable answering.

Chief Anderson – If I had a concern that they would not be able to perform at that level or in that capacity because of some prior history or something that occurred.

Lynn Moffa - Would it be documented somewhere? I know it would help to have some documentation. That would help if there had access to it in case of a grievance down the road. How would that happen?

Chief Anderson – If an individual grieved, that information would have to be presented and most likely will be part of their personnel file.

Lynn Moffa – If it was documented at the time, not later on as a justification, you're saying you later on with a grievance you can go back and explain because there is a file but what I'm saying is a written memo that said this person was passed over because of x, y, or z.

Kelley Dickens – It going to be a matter of the employee's personnel file.

Lynn Moffa – I'm not talking about something in the personnel file as much as promotion board has documentation in file related to it.

Kelley Dickens - That would be private and confidential information and couldn't be provided to committee.

Lynn Moffa – I'm talking about if a grievance occurred and not it make public but make it available to the Board if it happened.

Patsy Brison – Wherever it is located it's still a personnel situation.

Lynn Moffa – You're saying there's something in their personnel file that maybe already that said that.

Alan Coxie – Her question is, do you document that?

Chief Anderson – The one time that occurred I met with the employee and explained what was happening. There was no documentation put in his file. If it did go to a grievance, I could articulate the reason for my decision backed up by whatever action was in that personnel file.

Alan Coxie – I could see a scenario where the decision is made and then for other reasons the dept. head leaves the City and a new one comes there wouldn't be any documentation for them to look at to testify on.

Lynn Moffa – I'm only saying this to protect the department later on and how to protect yourself later on. Something that says this is what I told him and that person says something different.

Chief Anderson – I'm not opposed to that. It happens so rarely that it wouldn't be an issue. In the future, it's something we could do.

Carolyn Worthington – It seems that maybe asking for some sort of documentation would support the decision and keep it from rising to the level of a grievance. Is that what you're saying? Something as simple as a memo to the file, is that what you're saying?

Lynn Moffa – Yes, it would be justified if needed, and documented and not arbitrarily done. Would that give you some level of comfort on the oversight issue, Marv?

Marv Rosen - There is a potential for this process perception wise and real life wise if all efforts of assessments techniques to measure a candidate's ability has the potential to be over ridden. Example: grievance at the end of the eligibility not the 15 day deadline. It's a perception issue. The potential exists that making your interview weighing it in so that it meets the other criteria and the person has already successfully passed. It's just an issue for me. I think every manager has to have that discretion, it's the degree of discretion that can over weigh the other criteria.

Alan Coxie – That is a process issue. If you go and hire an outside firm and use outside assessors then come back at end and add the last component being highly subjective that isn't as transparent, it kind of kills everything that goes before it. We have two departments doing it two different ways. I think it is good to try different processes and see what works. I am comfortable allowing a department head to do this because the departments are dramatically different. Transparency is a concern because this Board is asked to make a determination after the fact.

Lynn Moffa - I'd like to ask the other Board members that were here when this was passed, what was your thought process when you passed it?

Marv Rosen – I think it's consistent with what Alan was saying; my interest is the process working, what we've heard from chief, committee, Human Resources, that the process was working. I personally would like to see more transparency, I don't know if others on the Board are interested in revising the policy at this point.

Chief Anderson – If I may answer, we have not had a single issue in my opinion. Maybe someone brought some issues to you that I don't know about. If process isn't working, I'd like to know that. I ask every candidate if they think the process is fair.

Alan Coxie – Can you appreciate the candidate might not be forthcoming at that time? They might just wait.

Chief Anderson – I hope that by giving them every bit of information about the process, if there were some concerns or if they have question, I would hope they would bring it to my attention.

Lynn Moffa – It took one instance like AFR then a lot of people come forward to say they didn't like it. It is no guarantee that you won't end up with a grievance.

Chief Anderson – I'm not saying there isn't room for improvement, but whatever those concerns are, I'd like for them to come to me or the committee.

Allan Coxie – The fire chief's has scheduled numbers and values and uses last interview as 5%. How would you feel about using that and if not why?

Chief Anderson – I would prefer not to use that, I think adding extra could cause a grievance. I don't want to be accused of giving this individual five more points because I like this person over the next person. I think our process because of the way they are scored there's no threat or concerns that I'm going to score this person higher than the other person.

Marv Rosen – To qualify Chief, Chief Burnette only uses the 5% as a tie breaker. I think employees could reach out to your advisory committee. I don't see any interest in revising policy at this time. At this point, I'd like to thank you for being here today. I appreciate your candor and you've answered a lot of questions for me.

Alan Coxie – I agree with Marv and I appreciate the fact that we're coming back 2 years later and having this discussion. I remember that conversation well that was in the Municipal Building in the training room after these minutes were forwarded to me. It must be difficult to come before us and answer our questions. I appreciate that.

Chief Anderson – I appreciate the opportunity to go back and look at things that maybe need another look.

Marv Rosen – I just have two other items on other business. We had a grievance withdrawn and Derrick was very helpful with this.

Patsy Brison – To put it on record we could say that officer Joseph Kanupp has withdrawn his grievance. I think we talked about it at one of the other meetings. I think we discussed the scheduling it. That way it will be in the minutes in case somebody looks for it.

Discussion about what was done in earlier meetings discussing the possible grievance.

Marv Rosen – The next item is a communication item. I had asked Derrick if he could send out e-mail to all City employees about the agenda for this upcoming meeting, Kelley Dickens asked me to put this up for discussion today as to how Civil Service Board

announcements are broadcast to the general classified section and all other City employees. Derrick did send out an e-mail to police officers and also listed on the intranet, correct Derrick?

Derrick Swing – I sent it to all City employees on March 28th and a link to the public internet under Boards and Commissions that lists meetings with minutes and agendas.

Marv Rosen – I appreciate your doing that but I think Kelley had a broader sense of how our meetings can be published or communicated.

Kelley Dickens – On a quarterly basis, we would like to do is to e-mail employees with reminders with the date of the meeting and a link to the site with the agenda and minutes. I think that is probably the best practice that we remind them on a quarterly basis.

Marv Rosen - With other boards and commissions, how often are employees notified?

Kelley Dickens – I don't think employees are reminded every two weeks they are usually directed to website where boards and commissions schedules are kept. We get a ton of e-mail traffic in the City so I don't think that an e-mail every month is effective, but just a reminder on a quarterly basis would work.

Marv Rosen– I just want to keep reminding employees that we're here for them and if there is a specific agenda item that would affect their department. Quarterly sounds reasonable. Are there any more thoughts from anyone else?

Alan Coxie – I, as a former employee, appreciate getting it out there. I think that quarterly would be appropriate.

Marv Rosen – Are there any other comments in terms of communication?

Carolyn Worthing – I will be out of town next meeting just to let you know.

Marv Rosen – Thanks. I want to return to my opening comments about my meeting today I've become sensitive to open meetings and what can be shared. Does anyone have any questions?

Kelley Dickens – I think we will be scheduling a future work session to discuss this.

Lynn Moffa – Was this prompted by complaints?

Marv Rosen – It was more of a concern. I think council woman Wisler had some specific questions about the questions I had asked and if they were within the scope of the Board. Specifically asking the chief if he had any update on his strategic plan. The question was that was it in bounds of our scope of responsibility. I asked purely for information. We discussed that.

Lynn Moffa – We would need to know because that would apply to us also and what the concerns are.

Council Woman Wisler – Yes, that was the idea of a work session to talk about responsibilities.

Carolyn Worthington – It would also be good to let the employees know what our role is.

Marv Rosen – There is a historical tug between the administration and the Civil Service Board. I sincerely would like for us to work together to solve problems. I have served on boards since 2009 and there were some pretty nasty things going on back then with the previous administration and some of the Civil Service Board members themselves. This has been much more pleasant and we can work together and get much further once we learn our roles. My leadership style may not be one that people are accustomed to. I probably have allowed some comments to progress beyond bounds of reasonableness. I will make the commitment to try and be a stronger leader.

Lynn Moffa – Just for the record I never noticed you doing anything that seems unreasonable. I'm not sure it is clear in the law what is permissible or what is not. The goal to clarify that is a good one.

Alan Coxie – I echo her comment. I don't think it's so clear. I've read it for five years now; I think it is very open to interpretation. I'm ever mindful of questions and how they are answered. I don't feel it is appropriate to ask certain forms of questions, I just rely on the professional expertise of personnel to make decisions and they can decide what level of information to give.

Council Woman Wisler – No one in City Administration has said anything about Mr. Rosen's style.

Kelley Dickens – We can get into more specifics at the work session. I know it wasn't on the agenda for today, but I feel we can have some meaningful discussion at the next meeting on some of the areas where we feel we've strayed off course a little bit.

Patsy Brison – Maybe for scheduling purposes staff can recommend some dates for the Board. One possibility is at a regular Board meeting where you don't have much business to discuss and have an extended discussion rather than a separate meeting.

Marv Rosen - Are there any other comments or questions? (None) I move that we adjourn.

Alan Coxie – I second that motion.

Marv Rosen - All in favor? None opposed. Adjourned.